REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 22, 2005. Claims 12, 14, 15, 27, 29, 30, 42, 44 and 45 remain pending in the application, with Claims 13, 28 and 43 having been cancelled herein. Claims 12, 27 and 42 are the independent claims herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 12 to 15, 27 to 30 and 42 to 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

In more detail, the Office Action entered the rejections based on an alleged unclarity as to what is being controlled. The claims are clear both on their face and when read in conjunction with the specification that what is being controlled is the direction of image pickup device itself (i.e., the user is controlling the direction of the image pickup device to control what image is being picked up by the device). Thus, withdrawal of the § 112 rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 12 to 15, 27 to 30 and 42 to 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,311,124 (Rhoads). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns accessing an address based on a predetermined image included in a picked-up image. According to the invention, a device monitors whether or not a predetermined image is included in a received image, which is picked-up by an image pickup device that is controlled based on a control command that controls a direction of the image pickup device. If the predetermined image is included in the received image, an address corresponding to the predetermined image is extracted from

- 7 -

the received image. The extracted address is then accessed based on the result of the monitoring and when a user performs a process to designate the predetermined image.

With specific reference to the claims, amended independent Claim 12 is an access system, comprising an operation device for outputting a control command of a direction of an image pickup device, a receiving device for receiving an image picked up by the image pickup device which is controlled based on the control command of the direction of the image pickup device, and a control device for extracting an address corresponding to a predetermined image included in the image received by the receiving device, a monitoring device for monitoring whether the image received by the receiving device includes a predetermined image, and an accessing device for accessing the address extracted by the control device corresponding to the predetermined image if the monitoring device monitors that the received image includes the predetermined image and a user performs an operation to designate the predetermined image.

Amended independent Claims 27 and 42 are method and computer program claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 12.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 12, 27 and 42, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of monitoring whether a received image includes a predetermined image, extracting an address corresponding to the predetermined image included in the image received by the receiving device, and accessing the extracted address corresponding to the predetermined image if it is monitored that the received image includes the predetermined image and a user performs an operation to designate the predetermined image.

Rhoads is merely seen to use a digital camera to scan-in stenographically

- 8 -

encoded data from objects, such as a credit card. The scanned-in data is then recognized so that a link can be established with a website. Thus, Rhoads merely inputs an image and automatically accesses a link based on the image. However, Rhoads is not seen to disclose that an address corresponding to a predetermined image when it is monitored that the predetermined image is included in a received image and a user performs a process to designate the predetermined image.

The Office Action contends that Rhoads' use of be-doop data can be *any* type of data that can be encoded in an image frame. Thus, according to the Office Action, Rhoads teaches the features of the claimed invention. However, Applicant disagrees that the use of any data somehow teaches for foregoing process of the invention. Additionally, Applicant wishes to point out that the description at column 10, lines 9 to 50 of Rhoads may be more pertinent than other portions of Rhoads relied upon by the Examiner. In this regard, the foregoing portion describes a user holding a card up to an image capture device, whereby a computer displays an internet web page for the user to then customize the greeting card. Thus, while Rhoads may access an address corresponding to the greeting card, it nonetheless is not believed to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of monitoring whether a received image includes a predetermined image, extracting an address corresponding to the predetermined image included in the image received by the receiving device, and accessing the extracted address corresponding to the predetermined image if it is monitored that the received image includes the predetermined image and a user performs an operation to designate the predetermined image.

- 9 -

Accordingly, independent Claims 12, 27 and 42, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable over Rhoads.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant
Edward A. Kmett
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 105138v1

- 10 -